

Amendments to the Drawings:

Submitted herewith are 2 sheets of replacement drawings, with Figs. 2 and 3 labeled as "Prior Art" as requested by the Examiner. Please substitute such replacement drawing sheets for those originally filed. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Drawings

Figures 2 and 3 in the replacement drawing sheets submitted herewith have been designated by the legend --Prior Art—as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,815,886 to Kawase in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,211,613 to May. The Examiner states Kawase discloses an organic light emitting display having a periodic grating structure that induces surface plasmon cross coupling in a metallic electrode layer to emit polarized light. While acknowledging Kawase is silent regarding the OLED further comprising a polarizer, wherein the polarizer is oriented such that the emitted polarized light passes through the polarizer without being substantially absorbed, the Examiner further states that in the same field of endeavor, May discloses an EL device comprising a circular polarizer oriented such that the “emitted polarized light” passes through the polarizer without being substantially absorbed, teaches the suitability of said polarizer for improving the contrast of the display, by absorbing light from the environment (see at least Col. 1, lines 55-58), and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a polarizer to the device of Kawase, in order to increase the contrast of the image as taught by May. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

While Kawase does describe light emitting devices comprising periodic grating structures in the form of a corrugated surface, as discussed at col. 5, lines 7+ thereof the basic function of such corrugated surface is to couple light in a waveguide propagation mode with light in a radiative mode so as to cause much of the generated light conventionally trapped in waveguide modes to be emitted from the device in the radiative mode. As further discussed at col. 5, lines 25+, refractive indices and thickness of active layers are selected to achieve the desired optical coupling. This optical waveguide coupling technique is not a teaching to design such devices with periodic grating structure in order to induce

surface plasmon cross coupling in metallic electrode layers. Surface plasmon cross-coupling is simply a different mode of operation than the optical coupling techniques of Kawase. Note, in particular, while a metal electrode may be used, there is no requirement for use of a metallic layer for the electrodes thereof, and there is no teaching or suggestion to design the system so as to actually achieve surface plasmon cross coupling. Further, there is no requirement, or further acknowledgement, that any emitted light be polarized light. Thus, even if it may or may not have been obvious to combine a circular polarizer of May with the light emitting device of Kawase, there is any event no teaching or suggestion to employ such a polarizer oriented specifically such that emitted polarized light obtained by surface plasmon cross coupling passes through the polarizer without being substantially absorbed. The proposed motivation of providing a polarizer to the device of Kawase in order to increase the contrast of the image as taught by May would not teach or suggest to orientate such a polarizer specifically such that emitted polarized light passes through the polarizer without being substantially absorbed, as May does not teach or suggest that the ability to increase the contrast by absorbing ambient light is dependent upon the relative orientation of the polarizer and the device. Accordingly, the present invention is not taught or suggested by the proposed combination, and a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

The Examiner's response to Applicants' arguments is that the design and function of the claimed apparatus does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus "satisfying the claimed structural limitations". Such response does not appear relevant, however, as there has been no citation as to a prior art apparatus that would in fact satisfy the structural limitations of an OLED device having a periodic grating structure that induces surface plasmon cross coupling in a metallic electrode layer thereof to emit polarized light in combination with a polarizer oriented such that the emitted polarized light passes through the polarizer without being substantially absorbed. Such periodic grating inducing surface plasmon cross coupling and polarizer orientation are themselves structural features, and the Examiner has clearly failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to such combined required structural features of the claimed invention. The Examiner's further reference to Hori (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,338) in response to Applicant's

arguments is also confusing, as it is not clear whether such reference is relied upon in any particular rejection. In any event, it is noted that Hori is also directed towards optical waveguide techniques, and not towards designs for inducing surface plasmon cross coupling in a metallic electrode layer.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawase-May as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Terao (US 6,133,581). The Examiner states that while the combination of Kawase-May does not disclose the limitation of the first electrode being non-metallic and comprising a metallic layer formed on portions of the first electrode, Terao discloses an EL device comprising first electrodes including a non-metallic layer and a metallic layer formed on portions of the non-metallic layer, in order to reduce the resistance of the non-metallic layer, providing a high light emitting efficiency and a small power consumption (see Col. 4, lines 1-4), and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a metallic layer to the non-metallic electrode with the purpose of reducing the resistance of the electrode, while providing a high light emitting efficiency and a small power consumption. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested, as Terao fails to overcome the basic deficiency of the rejection based on Kawase-May as discussed above. Further, the use of a metallic layer as taught by Terao to reduce resistance is not a teaching or suggestion to employ such metallic layer with a periodic grating structure in order to induce surface plasmon cross coupling to emit polarized light. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawase-May as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Biebuyck et al. (US 5,855,994). The Examiner states that Kawase-May discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of a diffuser to mitigate the effect of color aberrations; Biebuyck discloses an EL device comprising a diffuser (see column 7, lines 18-35), in order to provide an organic light-emitting device having a light path for efficient emission; and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a diffuser with the purpose of providing an organic light-emitting device

having a light path of efficient emission. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested, as Biebuyck et al fails to overcome the basic deficiency of the rejection based on Kawase-May as discussed above, and accordingly a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.